



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/852,464 | 05/09/2001 | Ray Milkey | PA1676US | 6037 |
| 22830 | 7590 | 12/30/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| CARR & FERRELL LLP 2200 GENG ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94303 | | | SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2154 | |
| DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-58 are presented for examination. Claims 27 and 31 have been cancelled.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/14/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claim 1-23, 26, 29-30, 32-36, 38- 43, 46-49, and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by over Mitsutake et al. (6,240,460) (hereinafter Mitsutake).

5. As per claims 1, Mitsutake discloses a method for transferring files among devices in a network, comprising:

requesting via a destination device (2, fig 6) a transfer of a file from a source device (1, fig 6, col 16, lines 15-30);

scheduling the transfer (3, fig 6) of the file from the source device (1, fig 6) to the requesting destination device (2, fig 6), wherein the transfer is scheduled to be completed by a deadline (end time of the period in which the data transmission should be terminated, col 18, lines 41-49); and

transferring the file from the source device (1, fig 6) to the requesting destination device (2, fig 6), wherein the file transfer from the source device to the requesting destination device is complete by the scheduled deadline (end time of the period in which the data transmission should be terminated, col 16, lines 15-30; 18, lines 29-49).

6. As per claim 11, Mitsutake discloses a system for transferring files among devices in a network, comprising:

a destination device (2, fig 6) configured to send a request to a source device (1, fig 6, col 16, lines 15-30) for transfer of a file from the source device to the destination device (characteristic information, 1, 2, 3, fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30);

a source device (1, fig 6, col 16, lines 15-30) configured to transfer the file to the destination device requesting the transfer of the file (characteristic information, 1, 2, 3, fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30); and

a scheduling module (3, fig 6) configured to schedule the transfer (col 11, lines 1-21; col 16, lines 15-30) of the file from the source device in response to the request by the destination device (col 16, lines 15-30; 18, lines 29-49).

7. As per claim 26, Mitsutake discloses a method for transferring files among devices in a network, comprising:

identifying a file via destination device, wherein the file is to be transferred to the destination device (characteristic information, 1, 2, 3, fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30);

selecting a source device (characteristic information, 1, 2, 3, fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30) to transfer the file

(characteristic information, 1, 2, 3, fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30); col 18, lines 29-56); and
scheduling the transfer of the file from the selected source device
(characteristic information, 1, 2, 3, fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30; col 18, lines 29-56).

8. As per claim 38, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11, above.

9. As per claim 57, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

10. As per claim 58, Mitsutake discloses a system for transferring files among devices in a network, comprising:

a plurality of servers configured to deliver content to the devices in the network (characteristic information, elements of fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30; col 18, lines 29-56);

a plurality of clients configured to receive content from the plurality of servers (characteristic information, elements of fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30; col 18, lines 29-56); and

a scheduling module (control section, 3, fig 6; col 16, 54-67) configured to determine schedules for delivery of content from the plurality of servers to the plurality of (characteristic information, elements of fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30; col 18, lines 29-56), the schedules (control section, 3, fig 6; col 16, 54-67) being based on available bandwidth at the plurality of servers (characteristic information, elements of fig 6, col 10, lines 65-67; col 11, lines 1-4; col 16, lines 15-30; col 18, lines 29-56), available bandwidth at the plurality of clients (control section, 3, fig 6; col 16, lines 15-30; 54-67), and available bandwidth in the network between the plurality of servers and clients (control section, Summary of the invention; 3, fig 6; col 16, lines 15-30; 54-67).

11. As per claims 2, 18, and 34, Mitsutake discloses wherein the step of scheduling comprises determining available bandwidth between the source device and the destination device (determining and observing the use of bandwidth, col 9, lines 7-45).

12. As per claims 3 and 19, Mitsutake discloses the step of scheduling includes determining available storage at the destination device (col 10, lines 22-41).

13. As per claims 4, 13, and 33, Mitsutake discloses a user at the destination device specifies the deadline (end time of the period in which the data transmission should be terminated, col 16, lines 15-30; 18, lines 29-49).

14. As per claims 5 and 14, Mitsutake discloses identifying the file to be transferred from the source device (data identifier, col 16, lines 15-30; 18, lines 29-49).

15. As per claims 6, 15, and 32, Mitsutake discloses wherein a user at the destination device identifies the file to be transferred from the source device (1, 2, 3, fig 6; col 16, lines 15-30; 18, lines 29-49).

16. As per claims 7 and 49, Mitsutake discloses a pre-fetch module at the destination device identifies the file to be transferred from the source device (data transmission identifier, col 16, lines 15-30; 18, lines 29-49).

17. As per claims 8, 16 and 29, Mitsutake discloses the pre-fetch module is configured to identify files to be transferred based on observations of user behavior (data transmission instructions based data transmission control information prepared by an application, col 17, lines 24-67; col 18, lines 1-49).

18. As per claims 9 and 17, Mitsutake discloses wherein the pre-fetch module is configured to identify files to be transferred according to predetermined user preferences (data reception station name, data transmission instructions based data transmission control information prepared by an application, col 17, lines 24-67; col 18, lines 1-49).

19. As per claim 10, Mitsutake discloses a device other than the destination device requests the file transfer from the source device (elements of fig 6, col 16, lines 15-30).

20. As per claims 12 and 30, Mitsutake discloses the scheduling module schedules the transfer to be complete by a deadline (end time, col 17, lines 24-67; col 18, lines 1-49).

21. As per claims 20 and 35, Mitsutake discloses the scheduling module schedules the transfer of the file based on available bandwidth in the network (determining and observing the use of bandwidth anticipated by control section, col 9, lines 7-45).

22. As per claims 21 and 40, Mitsutake discloses the scheduling module resides at the source device (3, fig 6, col 9, lines 7-45).

23. As per claim 22, Mitsutake discloses the scheduling module resides at the destination device (2, fig 1, col 10, lines 23-42).

24. As per claim 23, Mitsutake discloses the scheduling module resides in both the destination device and the source device (1, 2, fig 1).

25. As per claim 36, Mitsutake discloses the source device is a server (col 16, lines 14-30).

26. As per claim 39, Mitsutake discloses the content is delivered to the client without a user being present at the client during delivery (having control section anticipates no user presence required, col 16, lines 14-30).

27. As per claim 41, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22, above.

28. As per claim 42, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 23, above.

29. As per claim 43, Mitsutake discloses the control server monitors bandwidth and storage resources in the network and provides bandwidth and storage resources data to the scheduling module (determining and observing the use of bandwidth anticipated by control section, col 9, lines 7-45).

30. As per claim 46, Mitsutake discloses the client is a general-purpose computer (col 16, lines 15-30).

31. As per claim 47, Mitsutake discloses wherein the client is a set-top box (col 16, lines 15-30).

32. As per claim 48, Mitsutake discloses wherein the request for delivery comprises a deadline for delivery, the scheduling module determines a schedule for delivery to meet the deadline, and the server completes

delivery of the content to the client by the deadline (end time, col 16, lines 15-30, col 17, lines 24-67; col 18, lines 1-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

33. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

34. Claims 24, 25, 28, 37, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsutake et al. (6,240,460) (hereinafter Mitsutake) in view of Tzelnic et al. (6,061,504) (hereinafter Tzelnic).

35. As per claims 24 and 25, Mitsutake fails to disclose scheduling module resides in a cache device in the network. However, Tzelnic discloses scheduling module resides in a cache device in the network (col 2, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mitsutake with Tzelnic

because Tzelnic's use of caching data stream would provide Mitsutake's system a method faster data transfer.

36. As per claim 28, Mitsutake discloses the file is identified according to a user subscription (exchange of information, col 10, lines 65-67, col 11, lines 1-3).

37. As per claim 37, the claim is rejected for same reasons as claim 24, above. In addition Tzelnic discloses the source device is a cache device in the network (62, fig 6).

38. As per claim 50, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 37, above.

39. As per claim 52, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 37, above.

40. As per claim 53, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 50, above. In addition Tzelnic discloses client comprises a cache management module configured to determine the size of the cache (col 18,

lines 1-6 and col 9, lines 14-19, software is exported to manage the transfer).

41. As per claim 54, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 53, above.

42. As per claim 55, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 54, above. In addition Tzelnic discloses cache replacement algorithms to add or remove content from the cache (col 18, lines 57-62).

43. As per claim 56, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 54, above. In addition Mitsutake discloses monitor usage (col 6, lines 53-59).

44. Claims 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsutake et al. (6,240,460) (hereinafter Mitsutake) in view of Tzelnic et al. (6,061,504) (hereinafter Tzelnic) in further view of Saliba et al. (6,052,710) (hereinafter Saliba).

45. As per claim 51, Mitsutake fails to disclose the client comprises a mini web server configured to receive a request for content from a browser,

determine that the requested content resides in the cache as pre-fetched content, and send the requested content from the cache to the browser instead of requesting the content from the server. Tzelnic discloses determine that the requested content resides in the cache as pre-fetched content (col 18, lines 1-9), and send the requested content from the cache to the client instead of requesting the content from the server (col 18, lines 9-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mitsutake with Tzelnic because Tzelnic's use caching data stream would provide Mitsutake's system a method faster data transfer. Tzelnic fails to disclose a mini web server that is configured to receive a request for content from a browser. However, Saliba discloses the client (108, fig 7) includes a mini web server (704, fig 7) that is configured to receive a request for content from a browser (112,fig 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mitsutake and Tzelnic with Saliba because Saliba's use of mini web server and browser would provide Mitsutake's and Tzelinc's system a robust scheduler with local cache management of data transfer.

46. Claims 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsutake et al. (6,240,460) (hereinafter Mitsutake) in view of Peinado et al. (6,775,655) (hereinafter Peinado).

47. As per claim 44, Mitsutake fails to disclose the server attaches digital rights management rules to the content prior to delivery. However, Peinado discloses attaches digital rights management rules to the content prior to delivery (col 3, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mitsutake with Peinado because Peinado's use of Digital rights management rules would provide Mitsutake's system a method of attaching license key to the transferred content.

48. As per claim 45 Mitsutake fails to disclose the client comprises a digital rights management module configured to implement digital rights management rules attached to the content. However, Peinado discloses the client includes a digital rights management module configured to implement digital rights management rules attached to the content (col 2, lines 56-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mitsutake with Peinado

because Peinado's use of Digital rights management rules would provide Mitsutake's system a method of obtaining license key from the server.

Conclusion

49. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,959,327

U.S. Patent 6,959,451

U.S. Patent 6,816,798

U.S. Patent 6,789,108

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS

 **JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**